

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 01 2007

U.S. Application No.: 10/826,532  
Amendment A  
Reply to Office Action Dated December 1, 2006

Attorney Docket: 2057.017

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, and 5-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, and 5-7 have been amended. Claims 2 and 4 have been cancelled.

**Claims Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

Claims 1-5 and 7-14 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that the limitation "and optionally at least two raised surfaces" recited in claims 1 and 7 is indefinite because it is not known if the raised surfaces are being claimed.

The language of claims 1 and 7 has been modified and the word "optionally" has been deleted.

The Examiner has also stated that the terms "high" and "low" in claims 2 and 3 are relative terms which renders the claim indefinite.

Claim 2 has been cancelled and claims 1 and 3 have been amended to more clearly define the sides of the non-circular sprocket body.

The Examiner is thus requested to withdraw the claims rejections under 35 USC 112.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmidt et al. (US 5,738,603).

Claims 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schlanger (US 6,428,437).

It is noted that none of the cited references discloses that the sprocket body has a non-circular shape as recited in the claims of the instant application. This can also be confirmed by the fact that original claims 2-3, which recite that the sprocket has a non-circular shape, were not

{WP402237:1}

- 6 -

U.S. Application No.: 10/826,532  
Amendment A  
Reply to Office Action Dated December 1, 2006

Attorney Docket: 2057.017


rejected over the prior art by the Examiner. Since now claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite that sprocket body has a non-circular shape, they are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art. Since the dependent claims 3, 5 and 8-14 are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 7, they are believed to be patentable as well.

With regard to claim 6, it is noted that Fig. 2 of Schlanger shows a carrier 40 to be engaged with a freehub body shell 4. It is not clear which part, the carrier 40 or the freehub body shell 4, has been referred to by the Examiner as disclosing a one piece spacer as recited in claim 6 of the instant application. If the carrier 40 had been referred to, it is noted that the carrier 40 does not have an outer perimeter including at least three projections extending in an axial direction. If the freehub body shell 4 would had referred to, then it is noted that the freehub body shell 4 does not have an inner perimeter including engaging channels and engaging protrusions.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw rejections under 35 USC 102.

Favorable consideration and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. Should further issues remain prior to allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Yonghong Chen

Registration No. 56,150  
Customer No. 30448  
Akerman Senterfitt  
222 Lakeview Avenue, Suite 400  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
Phone: 561-653-5000  
Fax: 561-659-6313

Date: June 1, 2007

(WP402227;1)

- 7 -